
The appearance of a new commentary on the first book of Tibullus' elegies on a scale comparable with that of K.F. Smith's standard English language edition (New York 1913, reprinted Darmstadt 1978) is an event of some interest, particularly as few further insights were added by M.C.J. Putnam, *Tibullus: A Commentary* (Norman, Oklahoma 1973). M(urgatroyd) offers an introduction, text, and a very substantial commentary. M.'s text is based on the OCT of J.P. Postgate (2nd edition 1915); the 43 variants from Postgate, as well as additional textual matters, are discussed in a critical appendix.

In the introduction M. discusses biographical details, the main characters of book 1, its chronology and its relationship with Propertius' *Monobiblos*. Unfortunately the texts of the ancient testimonia are not printed in M.'s edition, so that the reader who does not have at hand the complete texts as they appear in e.g. Smith 173–181 or B. Riposati, *Introduzione allo Studio di Tibullo*, Milano 1967, 369–376, is left slightly at sea in the ensuing discussion; even the text of just the *vita* and the epigram of Domitius Marsus would have made the argument easier to follow. M.'s conclusions on biographical matters are pleasantly cautious, and it seems unlikely that on the extant evidence much progress beyond these is possible.

The commentaries themselves are preceded by a short bibliographical note and an introductory essay. On p. 18, M., in addition to listing some general works on Tibullus, refers to H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to the Corpus Tibullianum*, Hildesheim 1971; but he has not taken into account some important work which has appeared between the publication of the bibliography and his own commentary (The most recent work cited by M. in the select bibliographies is of 1975 vintage.). Conspicuously absent is W. Wimmel, *Tibull und Delia*, Hermes Einzelschrift 37, Wiesbaden 1976. Acquaintance with this work might have helped M. not only in structural matters, but might also have shown that in 1,1 the transposition, proposed by Richter, of 25–32 to follow line 6 is not essential; M.'s verdict that "with the line-order as given in the mss. the themes of this half of the poem are hopelessly entangled and the progression of T.'s ideas is repetitious and erratic" (p. 298) goes beyond the evidence. Against his view it may be said that, with the retention of the original line order, *ipse* (7) picks up and develops *me* (5) (cf. Wimmel 9, 10), while the notion of work in 7 (which "seems odd and abrupt so soon after the wish for inertia in 5", M. p. 298) may well serve as a foil to the earlier *labor adsiduus* (3); negative-positive thought progression is common enough in Tibullus (see M. on *dux gregis* at 1,10,9–10; also 1,10,39–40). The case for *imbre* (1,1,48) rather than *igne*, favoured by M., is also convincingly stated by Wimmel, 40 ff. In his defence of *igne* (p. 300) M. refers, without quoting, to Pliny *Ep*. 2,17,23. It should be pointed out, however, that Pliny's *hypocauston peresiguum* is annexed to the bedroom,
and there is a world of difference between heating by piped hot air (the hypocauston) and a fire actually burning in the room (igne iuvante—while the occupant, moreover, is sleeping, somnos . . . sequi, 481). On the danger to the sleeper of choking as a result of such ‘direct’ heating, see Julian, Misopogon 341D. On architectural considerations, see A.N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny, Oxford 1966, ad 2,17,9 and 23, and Degering's article Heizung in RE VII 2646 ff. Even if igne could be stretched to suggest a hypocauston, it is unthinkable that the country cottage of the rusticus Tibullus should be equipped with so sophisticated a system of heating! On iugera magna (2)—rejected by M. in favour of multa—see now F. Cairns, Tibullus, A Hellenistic Poet in Rome, Cambridge 1979, 16.

Those used to working with Smith's commentary may wonder how much further the hunt for parallels can be pursued, and with what results. M.'s dependence on his predecessor is apparent throughout, most obviously in the many instances where the reader is referred directly to Smith's edition (e.g. 1,2, 51–52; 1,3,5–8; 1,5,3–4, 43–44, 47–48; 1,6,29–30, 35–36, 69–70; 1,7,47–48; 1,8, 19–20, 51–52; 1,9,23–24, 61–62; 1,10,11–12, 13–14, 39–40 etc.). Very frequently, however, M.’s encyclopaedic notes on verbal and conceptual parallels and literary affinities outdo even Smith's efforts; what emerges from this meticulous examination is the considerable extent of Tibullus' linguistic originality and innovation, and his generic and thematic manipulation and collocation. Examples are too numerous to cite. In the case of the ‘Hellenistic’ Tibullus particularly such an approach has yielded rewarding results. The generally accepted view that Propertius' Monobiblos appeared prior to Tibullus I, and the resulting question of Tibullan imitatio, are discussed in the introduction (pp. 13–15) and receive further attention in the notes, although the subject is not exhausted, e.g. Tibullus 1,9,21 might recall Propertius 1,1,27 (flamma . . . ferro: ferrum . . . ignes); Tibullus 1,8,9–12 and 15–16 contain, I think, a likely echo of Propertius 1,2,1–14 (with the key words capillus, cultus, nitere, artifex and indocilit; cf. also Propertius 1,15,5–8). Extensive references, in Greek and Latin writers, to motifs which also appear in some form in Tibullus provide an interesting conspectus for the literary historian, though important differences are passed over. Thus on the "condemnation of war" (p. 48, preface to 1,1) Aristophanes, among other Greek writers, is cited as having used this theme; it is worth remembering that while Aristophanes' hostility to militarism is a response to a particular war, the same attitude is a generic demand in Roman elegy. (The vociferous elegiac anti-militarism is paradoxically balanced by extensive use of military metaphors, on which see A. Spies, Militat omnis amans. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik, Tübingen 1930.) At 1,2,35–36 M. refers to no less than 7 passages, from Sophocles to Claudian, on the subject of "sounds causing fear": if this really is a vital literary motif, what about Propertius 3,15,27–28? Similarly at 1,5,13–14, on the "motif of bad dreams", we have 6 references, from Aeschylus to Macrobius, but no mention of Propertius 1,3,27–30 or 2,29(b),27 (or for that matter of Herodotus 7,12 ff.).
Painstaking attention to detail does not obscure M.'s consideration of such larger issues as genre, structure and thought progression; indeed it frequently forms the basis of interesting observations on questions of composition. In this respect he offers much more of value than either Smith or Putnam. The brief structural schemes in the introductory essays are supplemented in the commentary by analyses of verbal repetition and its function (good examples at 1,5,19–36 and 1,8,71–78), the technique of delayed revelation (1,4: 1,9) and the unexpected turn (1,4). The term “ring-structure” is used a little loosely on occasion, e.g. at 1,1,41 ff. (pp. 56–57) where the elements are very vaguely identified; the alleged allusion to religion in these lines, which is supposed to form part of the ring structure, escapes me. A similarly imprecise use of the term occurs at 1,2,15–24 (p. 78). (On the complexity of some Tibullan ring structures, see now H. Geiger, Interpretationen zur Gestalt Amors bei Tibull, Zürich 1978, 5–32 and Cairns, op. cit. 192 ff., where further literature is cited.) M. is throughout sensitive to Tibullus’ humour, irony and parody (e.g. 1,4; 1,6; 1,8). Tibullus’ innovations in the παρακλασιθεριον are well dealt with (1,2; 1,5), as is his use of didactic elements (1,4), while the problem of the genre of 1,7 is solved by the plausible suggestion that it is structured as an ἔμπινθικον.

And lastly some minutiae. M.’s abbreviations, very frequent throughout, are not used consistently: thus “Prop.” beside “Propertius” (pp. 3,13,50,51), “T.” beside “Tibullus” (99), “Ter.” (191) and “Terence” (283) etc. Minor typographical errors: “latin” (99); the absence of accents on φευγετον (135) and ἀ[ναξ] (284); “Pauly” is used for Pauly-Wissowa (277). Jibes directed at Smith’s display of non-classical erudition, a practice common among editors of his generation, are unwarranted (66, 164, 216 and 259–260; the last named instance is somewhat complicated by the misplaced last line on p. 259). Vague expressions like “it has also been claimed that” and “some scholars have recourse to” (209) are a little irritating.

Summa. Although M.’s edition does not make Smith’s commentary on the first book redundant, it nevertheless constitutes a considerable advance, notably on the question of Tibullus’ originality as a poet and on structural aspects; as such it is a very welcome addition to the growing corpus of Tibullan literature.

GOTTFRIED MADER

University of South Africa
Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

For further information go to: http://www.casa-kysa.org.za/acta_classica.htm